



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/076,362	02/14/2002	Alexander Druyan	AUS920011019US1	1508
7590	05/11/2006		EXAMINER DESHPANDE, KALYAN K	
Darcell Walker 8107 Carvel Lane Houston, TX 77036			ART UNIT 3623	PAPER NUMBER
DATE MAILED: 05/11/2006				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/076,362		DRUYAN ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Kalyan K. Deshpande		3623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 February 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Introduction

1. The following is a non-final office action in response to the communications received on February 14, 2002. Claims 1-28 are now pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 6 recites the limitation "the cache memory" and "this list" in claim 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Northcutt et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030126001).

As per claim 1, Northcutt et al. teach:

A method for displaying a list of service requests from multiple service request systems on a single display comprising the steps of:

receiving a service inquiry at a service manager location (see ¶ 65; where a work management person receives a service request.);

formulating and sending a service request status message to a plurality of persons from the service manager (see ¶¶ 50-51, 54-56, 60-62, and 65-67; where a status code is created or updated for a service request. The status of a service request is sent to the appropriate persons.);

receiving and merging responses to the service request status message from service ticketing systems into a single list of responses (see ¶ 72 and figure 17; where a summary of all of the service requests analysis and status are received and viewed.);

sorting the tickets in the response list by predetermined parameters and generating a sorted ticket request list (see ¶ 59 and figures 23-24; where the tickets are displayed in a list with several parameters presented. A user can sort the lists by clicking on one of the field headers.); and

displaying the sorted ticket request list containing ticket request from multiple ticket request systems (see ¶ 59 and figures 23-24; where the tickets are displayed in a list with several parameters presented. A user can sort the lists by clicking on one of the field headers.).

Northcutt et al. fail to explicitly teach sending service requests status to a plurality of service ticketing systems. A plurality of service ticketing systems is defined as a plurality of interfaces to retrieve ticket request information (see Specification pages 11-12). Northcutt et al. teach a plurality of interfaces that can be used to retrieve, view,

Art Unit: 3623

modify or edit service requests (see ¶¶ 53-55 and 59-63; where a plurality of interfaces available to users is described. Each interfaces enables different types of users to access information in a format most appropriate for their role.). Furthermore, Northcutt et al. teach sending service requests status (see ¶¶ 65-67; where upon submission of a service request, the service request is sent to a service request manager via email. The IT person responsible can update any of the submitted fields, including the service request status.). Thus, Northcutt et al. disclose sending service requests status and a plurality of interfaces (i.e. a plurality of service ticketing systems). The advantage of sending service requests status to a plurality of service ticketing systems is that it enables users to view updated data and changes made to data. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the feature of sending service request status to a plurality of service ticketing systems in order to enable users to view updated data and changes made to service request data, which is a goal of Northcutt et al. (see ¶¶ 5-6).

As per claim 2, Northcutt et al. teach:

The method as described in claim 1 further comprising the step of converting the service status request message to a format for each particular ticketing system (see ¶ 52; where service requests are placed into an XML or HTML format for each interface used by the users.).

As per claim 3, Northcutt et al. teach:

The method as described in claim 1 further comprising the step of converting the responses from the plurality of ticketing systems into a common format for receipt

Art Unit: 3623

and processing by the service manager (see ¶ 52; where service requests are placed into an XML or HTML format for each interface used by the users, including the service manager.).

As per claims 4, Northcutt et al. fail to teach the “sorted list is stored in cache memory”. It is old and well-known in the art to store temporary data in cache memory. The advantage of storing sorted lists in cache memory is that it enables users to sort the same data in multiple ways. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to one of ordinary skill in the art to store sorted lists in cache memory in order to allow users to sort the same data in multiple ways, which is a goal of Northcutt et al. (see ¶ 6).

As per claim 5, Northcutt et al. teach:

The method as described in claim 1 wherein said sorting step further comprises creating multiple sorted lists (see ¶ 6; where users can generate reports that sort data in multiple ways.).

Claim 5 further recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claim 4; therefore the same rejection applies to this claim.

As per claim 6, Northcutt et al. fail to teach the steps of “creating an integer array”, “comparing tickets in a one-to-one format using pre-determined parameters”, “directing the next free pointer in the array to the next ticket in the order as a result of the comparison”, and “storing this list in the cache memory”. It is old and well-known in the art to create an integer array, compare pre-determined parameters of input data, and sort the data based on the comparison of pre-determined parameters. The advantage of completing these steps is that it allows for the sorting of data based on

Art Unit: 3623

any of the available pre-determined parameters. It would have been obvious, at the time of the invention, to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the steps to create an integer array, compare pre-determined parameters of input data, and sort the data based on the comparison to the sorting feature of the Northcutt et al system in order to allow for the sorting of data based on any of the available pre-determined parameters, which is a goal of Northcutt et al. (see ¶ 6).

Claim 6 further recites the limitation of “storing this list in the cache memory” which is addressed by the rejection of claim 4; therefore the same rejection applies to this claim.

As per claim 7, Northcutt et al. teach:

The method as described in claim 1 wherein said sorting step further comprises: determining whether a sort map exist for a service ticket list (see ¶ 59 and figures 23-24; where pre-defined reports are available to users to display service request data. A report maps corresponding database fields to report fields when generating a report. Therefore, a pre-defined report is the same as a sort map.); and displaying sorted tickets based on a sort from a preexisting sort map (see ¶ 59 and figures 23-24; where pre-defined reports are displayed to the users.).

As per claim 8, Northcutt et al. teach:

The method as described in claim 1 wherein said sorting step further comprises: determining whether a sort map exist for a service ticket list (see ¶ 59 and figures 23-24; where pre-defined reports are available to users to display service request

Art Unit: 3623

data. A report maps corresponding database fields to report fields when generating a report. Therefore, a pre-defined report is the same as a sort map.); and

creating a sort map when there is a determination that no sort map exist (see ¶ 59; where users can manipulate existing reports to create a desired report.

Manipulating an existing report is the same as creating a sort map.).

As per claim 9, Northcutt et al. teach:

The method as described in claim 1 further comprising the step of:

determining the elapsed time since the last inquiry by a particular service technician (see ¶¶ 60-63; where a report can be generated based on the status of a service ticket assigned to him.); and

resetting the ticket lists in the cache, if a predetermined time period has expired (see ¶¶ 60-63; where a user can modify a displayed report or generate a new report. The modification or generation of a new report re-queries the database for and pulls new data in to the cache as described by the rejection of claim 4.).

As per claim 10, Northcutt et al. teach:

The method as described in claim 9 wherein said resetting step comprises retrieving additional tickets for the ticketing systems (see ¶¶ 60-63; where a user can modify a displayed report or generate a new report. The modification or generation of a new report re-queries the database for and pulls new data in to the cache as described by the rejection of claim 4.).

As per claim 11, Northcutt et al. teach:

Art Unit: 3623

A method for displaying a list of service requests from multiple service request systems on a single display comprising the steps of:

determining whether a list of tickets currently exist for an inquiring service technician (see ¶ 61; where a report can be generated based on the assigned IT personnel.);

sorting the tickets in the response list by pre-determined parameters and generating a sorted ticket request list (see ¶¶ 59-60; where users can sort based on any of the pre-determined parameters.); and

displaying the sorted ticket request list containing ticket request from multiple ticket request systems (see ¶¶ 59-61 and figures 23-24; where the sorted lists are displayed.).

Claim 11 further recites limitations already addressed by the rejection of claim 1; therefore the same rejection applies to this claim.

Claims 12 and 13 recite limitations already addressed by the rejections of claims 6 and 8; therefore the same rejections apply to the these claims.

Claims 14-28 recite limitations already addressed by the rejections of claims 1-13 and further recite a computer program product and a system which are taught by Northcutt et al. (see ¶¶ 51-53 and figure 2; where a system is taught. The system further has a workflow management system which is a computer program product.); therefore the same rejections of claims 1-13 apply to claims 14-28 as well.

Conclusion

Art Unit: 3623

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following are pertinent to the current invention, though not relied upon:

McPartlan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6850613) teaches a method and apparatus for performing customer service request allocations based upon real-time data and forecast data, calculates estimated handling resources for each of the transaction processing systems based upon actual handling resources and scheduled handling resources.

Toyouchi et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6847988) teaches a service providing system, a plurality of information acquiring computers for acquiring informations are connected via a network to a plurality of information providing computers for providing information.

Schwatz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6813278) teaches a process for submitting a service request in a local service management system.

Storch et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5920846) teaches an integrated system and method is provided for processing a service request for installation, maintenance or repair of a local loop maintained by a telecommunications company and providing locally switched service to a customer premise.

Chen et al. (Chen, Graham; Kong, Qinzhen; Etheridge, Jaon; Foster, Paul; "Integrated TMN Service Management", *Journal of Network and Systems Management*, December 1, 1999, pp. 469-493) teaches service deployment and management in the global telecommunications industry.


Art Unit: 3623

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kalyan K. Deshpande whose telephone number is (571) 272-5880. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8am-5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Tariq Hafiz can be reached on (571) 272-6729. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


kkd


TARIQ R. HAFIZ
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600